

REMARKS

In the Office action mailed on **16 June 2005**, the examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-9, 12, 14-20, and 23. Claims 1 and 3-9 were allowed. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 12 and 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcuello et al. (*Value Prediction for Speculative Multithreaded Architectures*, hereinafter “Marcuello (1)”), and further by Marcuello et al. (*Speculative Multithreaded Processors*, hereinafter “Marcuello (2)”), incorporated by reference in Section 2 of Marcuello(1) in view of Kumar et al (USPN 5,737,750, hereinafter “Kumar”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 23 was rejected because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended the paragraph starting on line 20 of page 7 to delete the non-statutory material. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 12 and 14-20 were rejected as being unpatentable over Marcuello (1) and further by Marcuello (2) in view of Kumar


Applicant has amended independent claim 12 to include allowable limitations from claim 1. Claims 1 and 3-9 were previously allowed.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, and 23 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-9, which depend upon claim 1, and claims 14-20, which depend upon claim 12, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: 27 July 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665